EXHIBIT B

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SKY02 005 US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of Yaron et al.

Serial No. 09/258,663   Art Unit: 2671

Filed: February 26, 1999   Examiner: Sealey, L.

TITLE: REMOTE LANDSCAPE DISPLAY AND PILOT TRAINING

Amendment

The Honorable Commissioner of
 Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Responsive to the Official Action dated July 5, 2001 please amend the

subject application as follows.

In the Claims:

Please cancel claims 16-30 and 46-56, without prejudice.

Please add new Claims 57-58.

57.   (New) The method of Claim 1, wherein the coordinates relate to the

coordinates of a predetermined course of a flight vehicle.

58.   (New) The apparatus of Claim 31, wherein said data blocks relate to

a course of a flight vehicle.

5004891.1

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-15 and 31-45 remain in the application. Applicant notes the allowable subject matter in Claims 8, 11-14, 38 and 41-44.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections:

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 16-17, 19-22, 31-32, 35-37, 39, and 46-51 stand rejected as anticipated by Migdal et al. ("Migdal") Claims16-17, 19-22 and 46-51 have been cancelled without prejudice and reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2, 5-7, 9, 31-32, 35-37 and 39 is solicited.

As recited in Independent Claims 1 and 31, the required block is downloaded from the remote server if the block at a required resolution does not reside on the local memory. Examiner asserts that this is disclosed in Migdal col. 8, line 66 through col. 9, line 36, but that passage discloses only the existence of a hierarchy of LOD maps and the memory saved by storing clip maps in texture memory. The Examiner also references Fig. 2 which discloses a processor, but fails to disclose downloading data blocks from a remote server as required by Claims 1 and 31.

Withdrawal of the rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 31 is solicited. Claims ultimately depending therefrom should be allowed without recourse to the additional patentable limitations respectively recited.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections:

Claims 3-4, 10, 33-34 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Migdal in view of *In re Gazda*, 104 U.S.P.Q. 400 (CCPA 1955).

5004891.1

The Examiner relies on *In re Gazda* for the proposition that reversing the order of elements is obvious, but the holding thereof is far more restrictive, dealing with a specific structure. Moreover, the Examiner is overlooking the major deficiency of Migdal, *i.e.* there is no disclosure regarding a downloading order based on resolution levels. *A fortiori*, Migdal fails to teach downloading additional blocks from a remote server if blocks at the required resolution level are not present on the local memory. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3-4, 10, 33-34 and 40 is therefore required.

Claims 15, 18, 45, 48 and 55 stand rejected as obvious over Migdal in view of Migdal et al. ('702). Claims 18, 48 and 55 have been cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration of Claims 15 and 45 is solicited.

Claims 15 and 45 depend from Independent Claims 1 and 31, respectively and are allowable therewith. As discussed above, Migdal does not disclose the downloading which the Independent Claims 1 and 31 recite and Migdal ('702) fails to obviate this basic deficiency.

Claims 23-29, 52-54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). These claims have been cancelled without prejudice.

5004891.1

Allowance of all claims remaining in the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Lawton Rogers, III
Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English
Reg. No. 42,514
Mark C. Comtois
Reg. No. 46,285
Patrick D. McPherson
Reg. No. 46,255

1401 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 898-1515
Telecopier: (202) 898-1521

Dated: October 4, 2001

5004891.1